DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 640 HE 011 375

AUTHOR Schubert, William H.; Weible, David M.
TITLE Curriculum Development at the University Level: A Case Study of Curriculum Development Grants at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle with Implications for Selected Issues in Curriculum.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 79
NOTE 59p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Curriculum; Committees; Comparative Analysis; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Planning; Decision Making; *Educational Objectives; Educational Practice; *Educational Theories; *Grants; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Program Proposals
IDENTIFIERS Grantsmanship; *University of Illinois Chicago Circle Campus

ABSTRACT

The ways in which a sample of faculty members from the University of Illinois at Chicago create curricula is described and compared with methods selected from the curriculum development literature. An overview is presented of the university's Curriculum Development Grants (CDG) Committee program, its historical development, and several domains of decision-making. Comparisons are made concerning: different orientations to the process of curriculum development and different positions on curriculum inquiry. Both individual proposal writers and CDG committee evaluators acknowledged the necessity to allow objectives to emerge from activity. The process of group and individual decision-making was found to be more political and value-laden than purely rational. Analysis of proposals also indicated that curriculum development is situational, that it embraces the entirety of the classroom environment. Study of the CDG process revealed a strong bias toward practical rather than theoretic inquiry. It seems that the more a proposal needs support, either economic or bureaucratic, the more it must be expressed in the language of the accepted epistemology. Further study is suggested before any definitive statement can be made about the syncretism of conflicting conceptions of curriculum. Information on curriculum development grants for 1979 is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172640

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL: A CASE STUDY OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR SELECTED ISSUES IN CURRICULUM

By

William H. Schubert

and

David M. Weible

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Schubert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Paper Submitted for Presentation at the

American Educational Research Association

Annual Conference, San Francisco,

April 8 - 12, 1979

HE011 375

SESSION 8.16

Introductory Dialogue

Unlikely though it may be, what if a reporter decided to interview a curriculum scholar? An excerpt might include the following:

Reporter: What is your area of inquiry?

Curriculum Scholar: It is called "curriculum study". Well, actually, there are some who prefer to call it "curriculum inquiry", some who label it "curriculum development", and still others who just prefer to call it "curriculum" or maybe the "curriculum field." In addition there are some who argue that the label "field" is itself indefensible (Westbury and Steimer, 1971). Still others call themselves curriculum "reconceptualists" (Pinar 1975). There are many more.

Reporter: I think I get the point. There is much confusion over the label. Some common factors, however, must bind you together as a group. What causes all of you to be given a label that has something to do with curriculum?

Curriculum Scholar: I don't mean to be difficult, but agreement even about this does not exist either. Nonetheless, I will try to respond. We all share a concern for the substance of learning. More specifically we are inter-

ested in studying the nature of learning activities and experiences had by students in schools. Sometimes we study such matters in other institutions, but most often with regard to schools. Moreover, we are interested in origins of these learning experiences, who determines them and/or what forces contribute to their existence. We are not only interested in describing, but also in prescribing. We often prescribe procedures for determining the substance of intentional learning, sometimes even the substance itself and how to best implement it. So we are concerned about plans and purposes, activities that can foster the purposes, and ways to "package" the activities. We are also interested in how to find out what our curriculum conveys. We call this curriculum evaluation. Of course, the purpose of evaluation is to improve curriculum. We refer to such improvement by many names: revision, reform, renewal, change, and the like. Further, we want to know how to inquire about all of the above effectively. I'm sure others would take issue with what I have said, but it's

a brief rendition.

Reporter: I think that I am beginning to see the domain of curriculum studies, or whatever you call them. I suppose that there are differing orientations within the areas of concern that you raised. I imagine the number of proposals for alternative types of experiences, activities, and curriculum "packagings" is indeed great. Are there just as many differing positions on the determination of curriculum practices, or even on how to study about this phenomenon of curriculum?

Curriculum Scholar: I am glad that you didn't request a review of proposed practices; you are quite right that a great number exist although actual practice scarcely reflects this diversity. As to your other questions, I am afraid that considerable numbers of orientations exist here, too.

Reporter: Can you group them, or can you highlight several of your favorite contenders?

Curriculum Scholar: I'll give it a try. For some time, a conception of curriculum known as the "Tyler Rationale" (Tyler, 1949) has dominated the scene. Ralph Tyler contends that the major components of curriculum center in questions

about how to determine four matters: purposes, learning experiences, organizational patterns, and evaluation. A rhetoric that closely resembles Tyler's categories not only dominates curriculum texts used in training administrators and teachers, but is ever present in lesson plan books, teachers' guides to textbooks, curriculum guides, etc. Herbert Kliebard (1970), among others, challenges this view by asserting that the "Tyler Rationale" is too rational, that it fails to account for social, political, economic and other forces that contribute greatly to curriculum activity. Decker Walker (1971) argues for similar position and presents a "naturalistic model" of curriculum development. In this model he identifies three categories to characterize the way curriculum is developed. He claims that design is the product of deliberation, but that deliberation is the result of a hodgepodge of beliefs, prejudices, ideas, feelings, and power associations of deliberators, i.e., a platform.

Reporter: Could it be that Tyler's model is prescriptive of a rational ideal, while Walker's is descriptive of what is?

Curriculum Scholar? It's not entirely clear.

Reporter: Are there more positions?

Curriculum Scholar: Many. Allow me to note a few of these. Dahllof (1971) and Lundgren (1972) for example, suggest that "frame factors", many of which are beyond the control of school personnel, determine great amounts of the curriculum. Others such as Mager (1975) and Popham (1970) claim that increasing behavioral specifications in stating objectives brings learning and curriculum under greater control, providing means-ends accountability. Still others argue that purposes or objectives are not suitable starting points. John Dewey (1916, 1931, 1938) contends that objectives, a sense of direction, are clearly outcomes of inquiry rather than prerequisite directors of it. Goodlad (1978) accents a similar position by arguing that objectives are merely set as a convenient hitching post to which to tether activities under the guise of science whatever they turn out to be. Another position is represented by a number of articles by Michael Apple and is captured in the title of his recent book, Ideology and curriculum (1979). He contends that the principles of knowledge preservation and distribution at work in schools perpetuate socio-economic class relationships.

Reporter: That is quite an array of ways to view the determination of curricula. It seems that they all may have corollaries that relate to the question of how curriculum can best be studied. Is this the case?

Curriculum Scholar: Although each of the positions mentioned is indirectly related to the question of how curriculum should be studied, some authors directly address this issue. Joseph Schwab (1970) presents two "languages" for curriculum inquiry. From Aristotelian roots, he calls the dominant one of the day "Theoretic" and advocates a move toward the "Practical". The Theoretic is the usual social science behavioristic methodology that is widely used in educational research. It abstracts problems from situational contexts, divests them of uniquenesses, and assumes that law-like pronouncements about educational phenomena are possible, that they are to be discovered by induction, and that general knowledge is the proper end of educational inquiry. The Practical language of inquiry however, assumes that problems cannot be meaningfully addressed if abstracted from their context. Thus, specifics should be studied by interacting with situations.

The end of such study is situational decision and action rather than dissemination of information for its own sake or for the sake of publication.

In another explanation, Pinar (1978) asserts that three general orientations to curriculum inquiry exist: traditionalist, conceptual-empiricist, and reconceptualist. Traditionalists are closely linked to schools but try to produce guidelines for practice that fit many different kinds of school circumstances by drawing upon their experience with schooling. Conceptual-empiricists try to gather objective data, generalized knowledge, that explain curricular phenomena in many domains. Both traditionalists and conceptual-empiricists have much in common with Schwab's Theoretic language. Pinar's reconceptualist position is situation-specific, person-specific. It is an attempt to generate continuous redefinitions of curriculum work by use of the tools of existentialism, phenomenology, psychoanalysis, and critcal theory (See McCarthy, 1978), rather than those of conventional social science and behavioristic psychology. A major purpose of this mode of inquiry is to understand oneself as curricular

experience, as a journey in becoming.

Reporter: There is one point that you convey to me with certainty: curriculum study is filled with differing conceptions. I want to ask you a question about their worth and interrelation but I'm not sure how to do this. .... Maybe I can put it like this. In many areas of study I am certain that scholars fantasize about finding a "pure" testing ground for their ideas, theories, and tentative findings. They want to find a place where whatever they research happens, but they wish it could be a place that is untouched or unbiased by certain ideas. In short, they want to see if a certain way is, shall we say, natural. The Piagetian psychologist relishes the chance to test developmental stages in a culture where ways of living differ markedly from settings already studied. A medical anthropologist exults at the opportunity to study a culture where the incidence of cancer is far different from that in the modern industrial world. In like vein, I suspect that curriculum researchers would like to find a place where curriculum is developed by intelligent persons who have not been schooled

in the conceptual rhetoric of curriculum literature. Is this the case?

Curriculum Scholar: I suppose that they would. Given such circumstances, they could compare their models and frameworks with those generated by persons who want to solve curricular problems but do not have the conventional models. It is, of course, well known that business, industry, government, and the military have elaborate training programs, more sophisticated in design than those of schools. However, these are often created by consultants whose background is heavily endowed by conventional literature of curriculum and instructional design. It can be argued that they too utilize input/output, means/ends ways of thinking.

Reporter: I suppose that modern industrial culture is saturated with that kind of thinking. What is needed is an intelligent common sense approach to curriculum development that is unencumbered by conventional models.

Curriculum Scholar: There is a book called Common sense and the curriculum by Barrow (1976). He argues convincingly that a neo-classical curriculum makes eminent sense. Yet, his arguments are considerably more philosophical than is ordinarily accepted as common sense. What

is needed is a setting in which persons decide to develop curricula because they are genuinely interested in doing so, not because it is their primary job.

Reporter: Where can such a place be found?

Curriculum Scholar: I don't know. The job of formal curriculum making in schools and the private sector is almost invariably done by those who are influenced by models in curriculum literature. They "know" that goals need to be set, and they have a rough idea of Tyler's rationale. They have been briefed on curriculum. Unless they can be debriefed, I don't see any kind of untouched curriculum-making situations available for investigation. I do, however, share in the fantasy of being able to study such processes.

Problem and Purpose

The problem investigated in this study is at least two-fold. First, little is documented about the process of curriculum development at the university level. As the current and past chairpersons of the Curriculum Development Grants (CDG) Committee at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle (UICC), the authors have studied approximately 100 curriculum proposals by professors from many fields during the past five years.* Thus,

*It might be added that funds for curriculum development awards at the university level are indeed sparse. Therefore, this article is partially offered as evidence that such programs still exist.

one purpose of this paper is to describe how our sample of university faculty members create curricula. The second purpose builds upon the first as it directly responds to the question that the Curriculum Scholar could not answer in the foregoing dialogue: Do examples of curriculum development exist in which developers are relatively untouched by the usual information imparted through formal education in the area of professional education known as curriculum development? It is our overall intent to compare CDG curriculum development with samples of orientations to curriculum from literature aired by the introductory dialogue. We do not claim that this proves or disproves the worth of positions form the literature or the procedures used by the CDG case at UICC. We do hope that it will provide a detached stance from which partisan views on curriculum issues can be compared with intelligent common-sense based curriculum construction.

Assumptions and Limitations

Before going further several points should be clarified. The CDG program at UICC is not described as a generalized finding about curriculum development at the university level. It is not necessarily described because it is exemplary. It is described because its description contributes to the sparse body of literature on curriculum development at the post-high school level. Since faculty members at this level are experts in their subject areas, it is reasonable to assume that they are also persons of greater than average intelligence who are accustomed to rigorous study and careful problem-solving. They generally are more interested in doing research than teaching; nevertheless, it also is safe to assume that they want students to acquire knowledge, skill,

and appreciation relative to their subject area. If not for professors generally, this assumption is tenable for those who choose to devote extra time to curriculum development. This is especially the case in major universities where time devoted to courses is time taken from research, the latter being the greater source of the reward for professors.

All of the above, together with professors' usual lack of preparation in curriculum studies, produces a reasonable approximation of the contrasting vantage point searched for by our Curriculum Scholar and Reporter. This is certainly not intended as an argument for a "pure" or "natural" situation in the sense that it is free from the contamination or enlightenment that curriculum knowledge affords. Curriculum positions, such as those highlighted in the dialogue, are closely akin to past and present positions on scholarly matters in many domains. In today's technological society it is impossible not to be influenced by means-ends reasoning. Nevertheless, it is fair to assume that most persons who submit curriculum development proposals at UICC have not had direct training in curriculum development literature.

Thus, it is assumed that this study of the UICC CDG program offers three benefits: (1) it augments the literature on curriculum development at the university level, and (2) it provides examples of curriculum development that are relatively untouched by curriculum literature; and (3) it provides comparisons of the examples with selected orientations drawn from that literature.

Organization, Methodology, and Data Sources

This study is descriptive, analytical, and comparative. It provides description of the CDG program as a contribution to literature on extant curricular practices in its own right. An overview of the program, its historical development, and several domains of decision-making are highlighted. The study also consists of analysis of the CDG program relative to orientations on two issues presented in the introductory dialogue: (1) the process of curriculum development and (2) positions on curriculum inquiry. It is comparative in that alternative explanations and prescriptions of curriculum development and inquiry are compared with one another in a curriculum development setting that is not directly influenced by curriculum literature.

The principal method of inquiry is that of critical reflection on the program relative to the curriculum literature cited in the introductory dialogue. This consisted of several aspects. First, it meant a time for familiarization with the literature, especially for David Weible whose field is not curriculum. Yet this fact added interesting perspectives to the study. Next, written documents were examined; these included committee reports, past proposals, descriptions of proposal evaluations, and follow-up studies dating to 1972. Another method of data acquisition was to talk with persons from various levels in the hierarchy associated with the CDG process. This involved vice chancellors, department heads, directors of related committees, CDG Committee members, and grants proposers. The most important method of inquiry was involvement on our part in committee deliberations during the past five years. Interaction with a problematic arena is a defensible epistemological base in itself. Though not as

popular today as detached induction, it is supported by Schwab's "Practical" (1970), Pinar's reconceptualist position (1975), and by Maccoby (1967) who argued contrary to popular scientific belief that theory stems from critical insight derived from involvement in problematic situations. Though it might be criticized for being subjective, involvement provides an experientially based insight that embraces context. It does not rule out uniqueness in a search for generalizables. Dewey's scientific orientation is hardly foreign to this position, especially in Logic: The theory of inquiry (1938). What we hope to render from both our analyses of data and our reflections on experience with the committee, is a review of several extant views of curriculum development and inquiry to see how they map or relate to that which we have experienced.

The above is offered to emphasize that while this study is supported by empirical data, it is primarily an interpretation of learning from experience. It is an attempt to distill many hours of interaction with a curriculum development process over a five-year period, and to compare that process with others selected from the literature. Our interpretation of the findings is organized as follows:

1. Overview of the grants program.
2. Historical background on the grants program.
3. Comparisons with extant orientations to curriculum development.
4. Comparisons with extant orientations to curriculum inquiry.

Findings and Interpretations

The UICC Curriculum Development Grants Program

The CDG competition is an annual event at UICC. During each year the program moves through several stages of decision and action. Each stage is noted here and is referred to in forthcoming sections of this paper that

provide comparisons of CDG procedures with selected positions in the literature. (1) The call for proposals (See Appendix A) is written and revised in the fall of each year by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs with assistance from the CDG Committee Chairperson. (2) Faculty members throughout the University respond by writing proposals. (3) CDG Committee members are named by the Vice Chancellor. (4) The proposals are returned via department heads and deans to the Vice Chancellor. (5) The CDG Committee members review the proposals with the accompanying letters from deans and department heads. (6) The CDG Committee deliberates regarding procedures for ranking procedures and defending the rankings. (7) The CDG Committee forwards finalized rankings to the Vice Chancellor who allocates awards relative to the rankings. Usually, $20,000 to $30,000 is allocated to be used for summer salaries and specified materials and expenses for grant recipients. Five or six grants are awarded relative to rankings provided by the Committee. (8) Grant recipients submit an evaluation of this work midway in the following year. (9) The CDG Committee reviews the proposals and grants an extra award of $1,000 to the best curriculum development project. This is made available from Standard Oil of Indiana.

Historical Background on the CDG Program

This program has been in existence at both the Chicago Circle and Urbana-Champaign campuses of the University of Illinois since the Fall of 1966. It seems the initial impetus came from a funding offer

from the Standard Oil Company of Indiana for rewarding outstanding curriculum development efforts by U. of I. faculty. The University funded the summer program in order to generate a pool of development activity from which outstanding examples of achievement could be drawn. A committee was established to review the initial proposals and the subsequent project reports. Initially, the level of funding for this program amounted to forty to fifty thousand dollars for the summer grants and six awards of one thousand dollars each for the merit award recipients, three in Urbana, three in Chicago. With the onset of budgetary retrenchment in the early Seventies, the level of funding was cut back. The program was perceived as being in budgetary conflict with certain other programs most notably the graduate research program. This sentiment developed to a sufficient extent that it was deemed necessary to survey the broad achievements and effects of faculty developmental efforts over a span of five years. The results obtained through this survey were sufficiently impressive so as to effect the continuation of the program. (See appendix B). An additional result was the heightening of the committee's awareness of the need for public relations work in this area and the desirability of publication by grantees of the results of their efforts. Only in this did it seem likely that curriculum development activities might achieve something of the respect accorded to pure research.

Comparisons Relative to Curriculum Development

How is curriculum developed? How should it be developed? The literature is replete with viewpoints on both, only some of which

are supported by sound research. Selected positions, highlighted in the introductory dialogue, are now examined in four categories and compared to what was experienced, discovered, and uncovered in our participation as chairpersons and in our reflections on it.

1. The Predetermined or Emergent in Curriculum Development

The first notion of curriculum development is the predominant one today. It has existed since the field's beginning in the early 1900's. Essentially it holds that curriculum is developed by pre-specifying objectives or goals, conjuring up activities and organizing them in such a way that people acquire the goals. This is what Bobbitt, Charters, Snedden and others did in the early social efficiency movement. This is the thrust of the lists of guidelines called "principles" that dominate texts from Kilpatrick, Hopkins, and Caswell through Gwynn, Regan, Saylor, Alexander, and Taba. They reached a pinnacle in Tyler (1949). The taxonomies of Bloom and Krathwohl add categorical specificity. Popham and Baker (1970) and Mager (1975) refined the specificity by suggesting that pre-specified goals be stated in terms of observable--measurable, if possible--behavior. The analysis of tasks often led to competency-based curricula in which skills became substitutes for aims.

This position is radically different from that of Dewey whose notion of science was situational application of the scientific method to resolve actual problematic dilemmas. Thus, for him, a problem generated a need, an interest, and through clarification, hypothesis, and experimentation (in the course of experience) goals or objectives became the outcomes of learning activities. They were products of reconstruction of experience that brought meaning and

direction to subsequent experience. He argued for the inseparability at means and ends.

Goodlad (1978) also provides support for this motion in his development of an ecological conception of educational accountability.[1] He castigates the excessive preoccupation with goal-meeting and the myopia of those who select only those activities that are susceptible to scientistic measurement. In fact he argues that the prespecification of goals that inundates not only education but business, industry, and the military fosters emphasis on goal-attainment where none need exist. He argues that such emphasis on goals ignores "what is intrinsically beautiful and satisfying in experience" (1978, p.5). The playfulness of ordinary problem-solving atrophies in its conversion into work and the educative process becomes debilitated. Goodlad supports the argument by drawing upon the writing of Robert Rosen, a theoretical biologist, who contends that goal-setting is simply a preparatory step in the rationalization of whatever activities happen to occur. He criticizes this approach as a simplistic interpretation of science that merely carries the appearance of systematic management of educational activities.

Our analyses of curriculum proposals and discussions with participants indicate a marked tendency in favor of the Dewey or Goodlad perspective. Of 28 proposals sampled those that concentrated on activities dominated those based on predetermined goals by a ratio of 9 to 1.

---

[1]Perspectives on his view are forthcoming in a special issue of Theory Into Practice that is being edited by the Society of Professors of Education.

Proposal writers, including the winners, give primary attention to proposed activities. Activities are the starting point of planning conceptualizations. Most of the proposal space is devoted to descriptions of activities, materials, and related teaching strategies. Little is devoted to explication of purposes and even less to evaluation procedures. This is the case despite the fact that both purposes and evaluation are among the criteria set forth in the call for proposals.* When goals are stated they are much more frequently of the global than behaviorial variety. The fact that goals, as stated, are global does not portray the entire picture. That pre-specification is minimized in favor of activities represents an aversion to pre-specification and a belief in an indeterminant range of possible purposes, which are more properly ends that give aim and meaning to subsequent activity. The usual means-ends rhetoric, epitomized by the Tyler "Rationale", refers to learning activities as vehicles for realizing objectives. By contrast, we found a form of curriculum development more akin to the thought of Dewey and Goodlad. It might be said that in this view activity learnings supersede learning activities. Quite often the content of the proposal relates primarily to the development or amassing of materials with which the students are then to "interact", one hopes to good purpose. A classic example of this sort came from the history department. A professor, understandably concerned at his students' inability to view propaganda critically requested funding to gather propaganda materials from throughout the Twentieth Century and organize a course around them which would be designed to promote critical analysis. Just how this was to be achieved was not analyzed or stated with any clarity. While this omission

---

*See Appendix A.

doubtless contributed to the proposal's relatively low ranking, it was not, on the other hand, a truly decisive factor. Had the number and/or overall quality of proposals submitted for consideration that year been lower, the history proposal might well have received funding despite its somewhat vague formulation.

2. The Rational, Political, and Emotional in Curriculum Development.

Tyler (1949) and many of the general curriculum texts used to prepare teachers for curriculum positions in the Fifties and Sixties emphasize a highly rational position. From these sources one receives the impression that curriculum developers look objectively at the society, individuals, and other factors to determine needs. They formulate objectives that enable the needs to be met through carefully designed learning activities. Careful analysis of alternative ways to organize the activites results in selection of close-to-optimum patterns. All of this is then carefully engineered (see Beauchamp, 1975, among others) for transferral from curriculum committee "drawing rooms" to implementation in classrooms. Perspective would be lacking if we neglected to mention that these authors do acknowledge the existence of social, economic, and political forces and values. Yet, they assume that such forces and values are handled rationally by competent curriculum developers.

Decker Walker (1971) says that this is not the way it happens. From his observations of curriculum makers at work he concludes that the process is not nearly so rational. Kliebard (1970) and Kirst and Walker (1971) support this point by granting social forces and political power-wielding a place of prominence in curriculum. Walker (1971) describes curriculum-making as a three-fold process that involves platform,

deliberation, and design. By "platform" he refers to the network of values, beliefs, and concerns that the curriculum developer brings to the task. This includes conceptions of what exists and images of what ought to be. Walker draws the idea of deliberation from Schwab (1970) who characterized it as an inter-determination of means and ends, a process of decision that attempts to determine relevant facts and desiderata in the cases in question. It is a process of generating alternatives, projecting probable consequences, weighing costs and benefits, and making choices. The design, then is the emerging product of deliberation that accumulates in action.

How, then do these views relate to our case? The tendency is toward favoring the naturalistic conception of Walker. Application of at least two kinds is evident. The first pertains to proposals and the second to committee work. Plans are sketched in proposals; activities are proposed, but they are invariably incomplete. Evaluations are seldom of the rational means-ends variety, i.e., grant recipients do not base evaluations after initial implementation on an invariant set of objectives set down the year before. Instead, they acknowledge that application teaches them to modify both activities and objectives to meet the flow of unpredictable circumstance. Indeed, in some instances even where such acknowledgement was not forthcoming where even the claim was raised that the grantees had accomplished all their objectives and more, a comparison of the report with the initial proposal showed that in point of fact the same process of modification of activities and objectives had taken place.

The most powerful application of Walker's "naturalistic model" is reflected in deliberations of the CDG Committee itself. The Committee's task is to weigh and rank proposals. Committee members come to their task embodying many different experiential bases, holding many different values, and possessing differing styles of persuasive power. Moreover, all are doubtless interested in fairness, though all have different notions about what fairness means. All are interested in enhancing, at least not retarding, their own image with the group and the implications that image might hold in university politics. Indeed all are interested in choosing proposals of the highest quality. Quality does not always match with criteria. It was often necessary to read between the lines, and these individual readings often varied sharply from one another. Clearly, platform and deliberation map the course to the design that results in evaluation, i.e., the final ranking. At the same time a word must be said in favor of the rational model. CDG commitee members express a sense of rational as ideal, whether this should be the case or not. It is a sort of inward goading by rational muses that enables platform and deliberative differences to be overcome and to result in an evaluative design based on mutual approval if not consensus.

3. Power Contexts of Curriculum Development

Another perspective on how curriculum is constructed needs to be noted for it, too, is ever present in activities of the committee. We refer to literature from several domains that suggests that much of curriculum is determined by forces beyond the control of those who are acknowledged to

be curriculum developers. Dahllof (1971), Lundgren (1972), and Johnson (1977) assert that certain "frame factors" are well beyond the control of teachers and sometimes administrators. Neither teachers nor administrators have much control over intelligence of students, their social classes, their living conditions. Administrators have some control over the overall curriculum, graduation requirements, location of school facilities, length of terms or school years, and scheduling of courses. These and more frame factors are beyond teachers' control, and in our study beyond professors' control. Teachers and professors can exercise more manipulation over time allotments for a given area of study, thus insuring more or less exposure to that area. They can also manipulate levels of objectives, i.e., whether work pertains largely to memorization, interpretation, and application or to higher levels (according to Bloom, 1956) such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

In our study it is apparent that certain frames were set, that certain kinds of proposals could be made and others could not. Sometimes excellent ideas were proposed that emphasized both higher levels of thinking and activities that embodied great richness, but due to the influence of certain frame factors, they had to be discarded. Often otherwise admirable proposals were rejected by the committee because they were perceived to be central development projects for the department involved and thus really the department's responsiblity. Others suffered from the reverse situation and were rejected because of the level of departmental interest seemed so low as to suggest that the project would never win departmental support and implementation. If the project's proposer was a very highly salaried (full funding is 2/9 of salary) faculty member, that was sometimes a

negative factor inasumch as it meant that funding of that project would cut down on the overall number of projects to be funded. On the other hand, the committee also was hesitant to make an award to an untenured faculty member who was in his fourth or more year of the tenure track. In terms of promotion and tenure considerations, curriculum development is a most unrewarding activity. In a few instances, although departmental support was present, a proposed course seemed unlikely to win approval from higher levels of the administration and the proposal downgraded for that reason. Finally, in some cases the proposed development did not seem to be sufficiently transferrable, i.e., the committee felt that the project would be unlikely to survive beyond the proposer's departure from campus. This concern was most strongly felt when no learning package or product, no instructional capital was foreseen as an outcome of the summer's work. No one of these frame factors could doom a proposal, but they frequently played very significant roles in committee deliberations.

Another kind of contextual power is identified by Apple (1979), Young (1971), and others. They argue that the knowledge reproduced by schooling in any advanced industrial society is that of the dominant social class. It reflects the ideology, the value system, and ways of living of that class. It thereby promotes the class structure. UICC, like other urban universities has a large percentage of minority students, many from lower socio-economic classes. During the past five years, a number of curriculum development proposals were geared to meet special problems associated with the reproduction of knowledge for minority groups. In the past two years, for example, twenty nine percent of the proposals referred to special benefits for minority students who lacked academic skills valued

by the dominant social class. These proposals were built on the assumption that members of non-dominant social classes need special interpretations if they are to acquire knowledge that gives socio-economic power in social hierarchies of dominant classes. A case in point was a proposal to teach certain remedial math skills to incoming freshmen. The proposal stated, for example, that many of these students could not determine that .09 was less in value than .1. The question of funding for this proposal generated intense debate within the committee with one side maintaining that remedial work of this nature was not the proper function of university level instruction and the other side declaring that the university, once having admitted such students, was duty-bound to provide them with the opportunity to function successfully. While the debate remained friendly, the issue was never resolved to the satisfaction of all. The proposal, at any rate, was not funded. The interrelation of ideology and curriculum knowledge raises powerful implications. The epistemology accepted by dominant cultural groups in any historical period is indeed difficult to notice, let alone debate and set in perspective.

4. Curriculum Development as Situational and Personal

Another notion of curriculum development should be entertained, yet its author might not appreciate its being labeled curriculum development. Nevertheless, the ideas set forth by Schwab (1971 and 1973) are about the way that curriculum comes to be. They have some consonance with Goodlad's ecological perspective, and seem almost archetypical of Dewey's primacy of experience that leads to objectives and the implications that flow

from that idea. Schwab (1971) sees curriculum evolve within the interactive encounters that occur in teaching/learning situations. While certain policies or guidelines may be set forth in advance they are merely part of the interaction that becomes curriculum. As teachers read the character of situations they meet impediments in their attempts to execute plans. They search their repertoires of knowledge for theories to help explain these dilemmas and guide their action. Sometimes they find extant theories that apply rather directly, but this is rare. Often they must tailor theoretical knowledge to fit situations. Most frequently they must anticipate the flow of events and invent solutions to problems that match with no theoretical knowledge at their disposal. In this view the teacher is central to the curriculum development process and so are other major factors in classroom functioning. Schwab (1973) describes the dynamic interdependence of four commonplaces that create curriculum in classroom life: learners, teachers, subject matter, and milieu. Together they provide the journey of learning that is curriculum. Some zealous followers of Schwab mesh his notions of deliberation (1970) and commonplaces (1973) by suggesting that teams of experts engage in discourse about the nature of and interactions among commonplaces in each ongoing classroom setting. The irony in this interpretation of the "practical" is aptly characterized by Van Mannen (1977, 206) as eminently impractical in the ordinary use of that term. It is potently ludicrous to assume that teachers can manage to engage teams of experts who study and recommend classroom action in the multitude of specific classroom situations. A different interpretation is, however, far from ludicrous. Deliberation can be construed as, in fact, the continuous interaction of commonplaces that constitutes classroom

activity. Curriculum becomes the flow of consequences; it is never fully made but always in the making.

This view of curriculum making was evident in the work of those who received curriculum development grants. Proposals of grant recipients often reflect holistic conceptions of curriculum. Thus, curriculum proposals embrace not only subject matter considerations but their interdependence with particular characteristics of teachers, learners, and the milieu of policy, attitude, interest, and setting. Four of the twenty-eight proposals submitted referred quite directly to such interdependence. Others did so indirectly. In evaluation reports that follow initial applications of the proposed work, grant recipients refer to no less than the entirety of classroom functioning as the bailiwick of curriculum. Because of this holistic view, both proposals and evaluations seldom utilize a single theory; instead, they tend to derive their problematic character from the lack of it. They almost invariably seem to be statements of the need to produce explanations and prescriptions that are especially tailored to actual circumstances. It is this ad hoc quality of the majority of the proposals which frequently renders the committee's decision making so difficult. It cannot be denied that the process would be greatly simplified by obliging all applicants to state their proposals in a highly systematized, theoretical framework. The committee has, however, steadfastly refused to do this. It is felt that many worthwhile proposals would simply never be submitted under such a system, either because the faculty member was incapable of perceiving his situation and proposing an adequate solution within such a schema or because the generalized statement in fact ruled out certain situations and solutions from considerations. The committee does, of course, provide guidelines for the

submission of proposals, but the guidelines themselves acknowledge that they are not to be taken as universally applicable. (See Appendix A)

Just as these examples suggest that curriculum is a product of many environmental forces and that experience in any classroom cannot be meaningfully altered by merely changing the course syllabus, some of the proposals suggest the need for continuity of course experience with that of student life outside of the coursework. Just as Schwab advocates the need to view curriculum in environmental context, Pinar (1976) emphasizes the need to view curriculum in the context of learners' personal histories. Surely, it must be assumed that Schwab views his commonplaces to be significant because they derive from and influence persons. He sees the commonplaces, therefore, as basic subject matter for curriculum inquiry. Similarly, Pinar searches for the basic stuff of curriculum, and after all the accouterments are stripped away, the self becomes his area of focus. Focus on self may relate directly to focus on Schwab's commomplaces. Expanded beyond the classroom to embrace life more wholly, teachers, learners, subject matter, and milieu can be seen as a web of forces that define the winding course (curriculum) of learning that persons run (currere) throughout their lives. If persons are to learn of and from this journey, they need to embrace the experiences that they are. They are the past that is embedded in them. They are their projected future hopes, dreams, anticipations, worries. They are their vibrating present that is often obscured from their attention. To probe deeply into each of these and to synthesize the impact of knowing them better is a continuous reconceptualization of curriculum to use Pinar's label.

This curriculum of self becomes, in turn, enriched as persons learn to suspend preoccupation with it and "listen" to the curriculum of others. Each "listening" experience brings a new synthesis and each synthesis builds the curriculum journey.

Proposers of curriculum development projects at the university level are usually dedicated to their discipline. This is patent. Moreover, they often argue that the knowledge that they bear is essential to human betterment, at least to human understanding. They argue that their discipline offers knowledge that helps individuals assert a tighter grasp on certain images of the past, present, and future that makes them as they are. Many proposals indirectly reflect this faith in the value of their discipline to help persons acquire meaning in their lives; some address this end directly. Seven, or 25% of the proposals submitted during the past two years directly emphasized that personal meaning could accrue from them. For example, an English professor proposed curricula to impel religious literature students to formulate philosophies of life to give greater direction to their intellectual development. A Latin American Studies proposal was designed to give meaning to young Latinos within their social context. Such direct focus on personal meaning often runs counter to usual conceptions of university coursework. Consequently, they are infrequently funded, not due to their inherent educational value as judged by the FIPSE Committee, but to their instrumental value in a context of prescribed coursework. In short, departmental and university decision makers usually adhere to financial frame factors and give greater approval

to courses that generate large numbers of students and are perceived as central to department missions.

Modes of Curricular Inquiry

All aspects of the above discussion bear on questions about the proper character of curriculum inquiry. Each of the authors mentioned takes implicit stances on the ways in which curriculum should be studied. Schwab and Pinar address it directly. They both argue that curriculum inquiry, educational research for that matter, is dominated by a behavioristic social science epistemology. Pinar labels persons who engage in such research as conceptual-empiricists (1975 and 1978). Schwab (1970) calls them theoretic, using the term in a quasi-Aristotelian sense. Regardless of the label, the critiques are similar.

Those who use the mode of research criticized by Pinar and Schwab pursue research in certain characteristic ways. The source of their problems is conceptual, they think in terms of large catch-all categories of problems that cease to have any referent in the world of extant situations. They assume that it is possible to gather data inductively, i.e., to act on phenomena-under-inquiry and simultaneously to maintain objectivity. They believe in an ideal of universals or laws that explain and predict phenomena in the domain of their research. Finally, they believe that the production of knowledge is a worthy pursuit in its own right. Moreover, they are sustained by the faith that this knowledge of commonalities among situations has potential to explain and predict activity in similar situations. In a sense, then, such researchers somehow assume that commonalities among situations are more powerful than uniquenesses within situations.

Schwab and Pinar do not agree precisely on what the character of curriculum inquiry should be; however, they each advocate an alternative to the epistemological base that they fault. These bases are, however, similar. Schwab calls for a change from the theoretic to the practical. Therefore, he calls for a problem source that resides in a state of affairs rather than in a state of mind. He argues for inquiry via interaction with actual circumstances rather than induction across a wide range of largely dissimilar circumstances. He seeks situationally specific decision and action rather than knowledge qua knowledge. The major purpose of the latter is publication; for its application to resolve actual dilemmas is an ignis fatuus. The best that can be done in the face of actual curriculum problems is to engage in what Braybrooke and Lindblom (1963) call "disjointed incrementalism" or what Lindblom (1964) describes as "the science of muddling through".

Although Pinar subscribes more to practical then theoretic inquiry, he and fellow reconceptualists draw upon the critical theory of Jurgen Habermas (see McCarthy, 1978) and see curriculum inquiry within a context of metaphysics, politics, ethics, and psychology. Reconceptualists hold that curriculum inquiry must be emancipatory. It must create conditions in which whole-hearted dialogue is pursued with others, with persons from diverse backgrounds, and with one's own past, present and future. Such dialogue is made possible by the existence of common human problems, i.e., a common interest. Dialogue leads to criticism and criticism toward emancipation from the slavery of ideology, epistemology, dogma, mores, etc. The role of curriculum inquiry is to expose ways that school

curricula perpetuate such slavery, and to develop alternative curricula that exercise the liberating power that is the great potential of education. Thus, curriculum scholars must embrace the political if they are to produce emancipatory conditions.

The critiques and proposals by both Schwab and Pinar apply to the CDG situation. The circumstances surrounding the CDG process are quite different from the context of most curriculum workers. Curriculum scholars are expected to generate research, theoretic law-like statements that govern wide ranges of situations. Curriculum practitioners, similarly, are expected to create policy that fills needs for many different classrooms and students simultaneously. These scholars and practitioners are inundated with the conceptual-empiricist epistemology. It is their livlihood to do so. This, however, is not so for most CDG proposers. Most follow this epistemology in research for their discipline, but do not engage in curriculum development to produce generalized knowledge. They view it as course specific. Their proposals find their problems in actual circumstances. The knowledge of those circumstances is derived from interaction, as is the implementation of the proposed idea, if funded. The end of the proposed activity is the production of decision and action that improves the problematic situation. In short, the CDG proposals are more akin to the practical than the theoretic. Of a sample of 48 proposals reviewed and categorized, the Practical model dominated the Theoretical by a ratio of two to one.

Despite this, however, circumstances emerged that forced the CDG program in the theoretic direction. It might be said that certain

frame factors demanded that the CDG program justify its existence. Justification meant the need to use the theoretic paradigm. In short, questionnaires were sent to previous grant winners to discover long-term outcomes of their work.* Evidence for publication of products or reports that resulted from the curriculum development work helped to justify continuance of the CDG program. Moroever, the CDG Committee was granted a more technical role. The Academic Vice Chancellor recommended that the CDG Committee work in conjunction with the Honors Council, advising them about the technical quality of proposals and how they met pre-specified criteria. This, in a sense, geared the CDG committee work more to the theoretic.

Proposals that emphasized the emancipatory character of curriulum inquiry were negatively affected by frame factors. At first glance, it seems that professors who wrote CDG proposals were in a rather immune position, i.e., they possessed considerable freedom in course development. Nevertheless, members of the CDG Committee felt the need to base funding on potential for course approval and for numbers of students reached by a given proposal. Proposals were sometimes submitted for curricula that tended to engage students in potentially emancipatory dialogue. These proposals were generally praised for their imagination and ingenuity, but rejected because of frame factors such as consonance with required courses and likelihood of approval.

---

* See Appendix B

Despite the liklihood of rejection, certain "emancipatory" practical proposals were approved if they could be justified on theoretic grounds. A proposal in the field of architecture for honors students is a case in point. It was emancipatory in that students were asked to design environmentally oriented projects and submit them for funding. It was theoretic in that the idea of coursework culminating in funding proposals could be generalized to other courses. The fact that funding, if granted, would be an economic boon to the university constitutes another source of value approved in conceptual-empiricist or theoretic orientations.

Conclusion

Our conclusions, like our purposes, are at least two-fold. The first regards the study of curriculum development at the university level, and the second pertains to benefits that accrue from the study of curriculum creation by scholars who have little, if any, formal training in curriculum literature.

We found that curricularists need not travel to a far off island to find curriculum development that is done by persons not formally trained in that field. A naturalistic field site exists in the backyards of most curricularists, i.e., in non-education departments of their own

universities. The several conceptions of curriculum development and inquiry that were selected from the literature all helped to explain and interpret curriculum development at the university level. The obverse was also found. The study of curriculum work done by scholars not trained in curriculum studies can serve as a testing ground for curriculum prescriptions and explanations drawn from the literature. Further, such study can be a source of refinement of explanations and prescriptions.

Certain tendencies on major curriculum positions are supported by our study of the CDG process at UICC. These often gave most credence to less popular positions. The first issue explored was that of the emergent or predetermined nature of objectives. Both individual proposal writers and CDG committee evaluators acknowledge the necessity to allow objectives to emerge from activity. This behavior supports the contention by Dewey and Goodlad that objectives are outcomes of activity rather than determiners of it. The process of group and individual decision-making was also investigated and found to be a good deal more political and value-laden than purely rational. Thus, political conceptions of Walker, frame factors of Dahllof and Lundgren, and ideological arguments of Apple are found to be more fully considered in the CDG process than the kind of rational conceptions that comprise the dominant rhetoric of curricula literature and practice. Analyses of proposals also indicate that curriculum development is situational, that it embraces the entirety of the classroom environment. In the face of this, perennial questions which dealt with the relation of curriculum to instruction lose much of their significance.

A holistic or systemic view is evident in proposals. Some proposals also demonstrate their authors' convictions that students, the recipients of curriculum, must be considered holistically. Holistic conceptions of students and learning situations in curriculum creation support treatments by Dewey, Schwab, Pinar and Goodlad more than they do the extant means-ends interpretations that dominate curriculum literature and practice.

Our study of the CDG process reveals a strong bias toward practical rather than theoretic inquiry. Still, frame factors and ideological forces create ever-present pressure to move toward the theoretic. It seems that the more a proposal needs support, either economic or bureaucratic, the more it must be expressed in the language of the accepted epistemology. This is particularly the case with projects that promote emancipatory inquiry. The more the substance of a proposal deals with emancipation from the accepted epistemology, the more it is self-defeating.

The final tendency distilled from our interpretation of the findings deals with the potential syncratic power of each of the curriculum conceptions compared with the CDG process. Although many of these conceptions are viewed as conflicting, they were found to pertain to different parts of the process. The Tyler rationale pertained to the call for proposals, i.e., a need to prespecify requirements. Thus, it served to organize written proposals and as encouragement to pre-plan as much as possible. It also served to guide CDG committee members towards greater objectivity than might merely evolve in political discourse. The Dewey and Goodlad emphasis on emergent objectives helped explain the need for implementation before the whole character of objectives could be realized. Walker's naturalistic

model" seemed not to apply to the same dimensions of the process as did the Tyler rationale. Tylerian questions were guides to individual proposal writing and planning elements. They may even have served as a format for describing a design. Walker's model treats the process of group decision and pertains to CDG committee deliberations. Likewise Schwab's treatment of curriculum as an interaction among commonplaces in implementation situations helps to explain discrepancies between proposals and reports of application. The reconceptualist emphasis on persons beset by ideological forces helps explain why proposals, though educationally valued, were not funded.

It is fully admitted that much further study is necessary before any definitive statement can be made about the syncretism of conflicting conceptions of curriculum. One point is, however, clear: the internal boundaries of curriculum study are hazy to say the least. Clarification of dimensions of curriculum development may lead to the realization that conceptions of curriculum are more complementary than conflicting. We need studies that show where the several extant conceptions map and do not map. Such study needs to evolve within a climate such as that advocated by Pinar and other reconceptualists, i.e., a climate in which those who espouse "conflicting" conceptions suspend their convictions and listen to others with a whole-hearted faith that what they have to say might be illuminating. One might call this a Deweyan idea of community that fosters transaction and leads to growth, or one might even call it a Platonic search for the ideal. Whatever the label, such a process is needed.

Our study of the CDG process of UICC causes us to believe that if taken together, so-called "conflicting" conceptions of curriculum may map more territory than any of them taken alone.. Our study further indicates to us that curriculum development done by university professors, with or without grants programs, constitutes a fertile domain for curriculum inquiry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, M.W. Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Barrow, R. Common sense and the curriculum. Hamben, CT: Shoe String Press, 1976.

Beauchamp, G. Curriculum theory. Wilmette, Illinois: Kagg Press, 1975.

Bloom B. A taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain: Handbook I, the cognitive domain. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Braybrooke, D. and Lindblom, C.E. A strategy of decision. New York: New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Dahllof, U.S. Ability grouping, content valididty and curriculum process. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971.

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Dewey, J. The way out of educational confusion. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Dewey, J. Logic: The theory of inquiry. New York: Henry Holt; 1938. A

Dewey, J. Experience and education. New York: Macmillan, 1938. B.

Goodlad, J.I. Accountability: An alternative perspective. Third Annual DeGarmo Lecture, Chicago: Society of Professors of Education, 1978.

Johnson, M.J. Intensionality in education. Albany, New York: Center for Curriculum Research and Services, 1977.

Kirst, M.W. and Walker, D.F. An analysis of curriculum policy-making. Review of Educational Research, December, 1971, 41 (6), 479-509.

Kliebard, H. The Tyler rationale. School Review, February, 1970, 78, 259-72.

Lindblom, C. The science of muddling through. In Gore, W.J. and Dyson, J. (Editors) The making of decisions. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Lundgren, U.P. Frame factors and the teaching process: A contribution to curriculum theory and theory on teaching. Stockholm: Alonqvist and Wikell, 1972.

Mager, R. Preparing instructional objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1975.

McCarthy, T. The critical theory of Jurgen Habermas. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1978.

Pinar, W. Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley, McCutchan, 1975.

Pinar, W. Notes on the curriculum field 1978. Educational Researcher, September 1978, 7 (8), 5-12.

Pinar, W. and Grumet, M.R. Toward a poor curriculum: Introduction to the theory and practice of currere. Dubuque, Iowa; Kendall/ Hunt, 1976.

Popham, J. and Baker, E. Planning an instructional sequence. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Schwab, J.J. The practical: A language for curriculum. NEA: Washington, D.C., 1970.

Tyler, R. Basic principles of curriculum and isntruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Van Mannon, M. Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. Curriculum Inquiry, 6 (3), 1977, 205-228.

Walker, D.F. A naturalistic model for curriculum development. School Review, November, 1971, 80, 51-65.

Walker, D.F. Toward comprehension of curricular realities. In Shulman L.S. (Editor) Review of research in education, 4. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1976, 268-308.

Westbury, I. and Steimer, W. Curriculum: A discipline in search of its problems. School Review, February, 1971, 79 (2).

Young, M.F.D. (Editor) Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of knowledge. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

November 6, 1978

To: Deans, Directors, and Department Heads

From: Richard M. Johnson
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Re: Curriculum Development Grants, Summer 1979

Seven to nine summer stipend grants will be awarded for curriculum development projects. These will be funded from an allotment that has been reserved by this Office for the 1979 Curriculum Development Grants Program. Joint proposals involving more than one faculty member and more than one department may be submitted as a single proposal.

Theme: Educational Opportunities for Honors Students

This year the curriculum development competition will pursue a thematic approach. Rather than accepting proposals for all kinds of curriculum or course development, which has been the case in the past, proposals are being encouraged for activities which promise to enhance the educational opportunities at UICC for honors students or other similarly well-prepared students. The kinds of projects which may be supported will not necessarily differ from those of the past; rather, the projects will be targeted for a segment of our student body which has probably not received adequate attention in the past. It is hoped that by providing this modest incentive, faculty members and departments will be encouraged to direct special attention to a rather neglected area of curricular development.

Stipends

The grants will be made only to full-time continuing faculty members. A full grant will provide two months' salary from July 1 through August 31, 1979 (based on 2/9 of the salary rate for the previous academic year). Application for partial grants of not less than one month will be accepted. Small amounts may be made available for special expenses. During the period of the grant, a faculty member may receive no other payments, including those from other grants, or be employed in any other remunerative capacity.

Review Process

The award process involves three levels of review. The first two occur at the appropriate department and college levels. Given the special character of this year's competition, the final campus evaluation will be by the Honors Council which will review all proposals forwarded by the Deans and make its recommendations for awards to this Office. The Honors Council will receive the advice of a special technical committee composed of William Schubert of the College of Education (Chairperson), David Miller of the Office of Instructional Resources Development, and David Weible of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Miller and Weible are past chairpersons of Curriculum Development Committees.

Evaluation Criteria

Curriculum development is interpreted in its broadest sense, including planning and design of educational activities. Departments and colleges may set their own evaluation criteria for proposals. Special favor will be given to projects which offer a new structural and methodological perspective on matters of basic educational concern. In addition, the committee ratings will be guided by the following considerations:

1. Identification of an academic need and justification of the proposal in terms of meeting that need;
2. Identification of objectives;
3. Description of the proposed curriculum plan;
4. Presence of plans for evaluating success of project;
5. Comments and ratings forwarded by the department and college;
6. Degree of innovation and imagination;
7. Likelihood of use and continuation of effort;
8. Realism of project scope assessment and feasibility of accomplishment;
9. Potential for easy implementation or utilization by others.

It should be noted that these points are not listed in any sort of rank order. Also, some of them may not be particularly applicable to certain types of proposals.

Proposal and Project Assistance

The Course Development and Instructional Design Divisions of the Office of Instructional Resources Development (OIRD) are available for consultation regarding the proposal preparation.

If other OIRD services are desired for the project, that possibility should be discussed with an OIRD director or the appropriate division head. A letter summarizing any OIRD commitment will be provided by the OIRD Director upon request and should be forwarded with the proposal.

Project Report and Special Award

On or before May 1, 1980, each grantee will submit to the Office of Academic Affairs 10 copies of a report describing in detail the activity which was designed during the summer's work and the results achieved in actually implementing the project on a trial basis during the course of the subsequent academic year. Such a trial implementation is encouraged during either the Fall or Winter Quarter of the 1979-80 academic year to allow submission of the report on a timely basis. The Honors Council and the special technical committee will study these reports and recommend a special $1000 cash award for the most successful project.

Procedures

Applicants should submit ten copies of the following directly to the Office of Academic Affairs by January 8, 1979. Applicants should check with their individual departments regarding the number of copies the department requires for its review and review by the college.

1. Abstract of the proposal (form attached);
2. Detailed proposal describing the project (see suggested format below);
3. Statement by the Office of Instructional Resources Development indicating its potential involvement in the project, where applicable;
4. Brief description of expenses beyond salary.

Deans or directors should forward ten copies of the following to the Office of Academic Affairs by January 31, 1979.

1. A statement from the department head commenting on the merits of the proposal, its relationship to departmental goals and the qualifications of the faculty member who prepared the proposal to undertake the project;
2. Departmental ranking of proposals if more than one is submitted from a department. If a specific list of criteria is used in making the ratings, a copy of the list should also be forwarded;
3. Report by an ad hoc college faculty committee reviewing the merits of each proposal originating within the college;
4. A ranking of proposals by the college if more than one is submitted.

Suggested Proposal Format

A suggested format is as follows:

a. Identify the problem or need;
b. Propose and justify an approach to resolve the problem and relate approach to need;
c. Identify any product that might ensue;
d. Identify innovative (imaginative) features of the project;
e. Discuss reasons for the project not being implemented with department funds;
f. Discuss feasibility and strategy of dissemination of project results, departmental or broader;
g. Discuss possible short and long term consequences of project;
h. Prepare a reasonably detailed timetable for the project;
i. Mention any arrangements made for OIRD assistance;
j. Discuss plans for evaluation.

Special Notice

A one-page notice about this year's program is attached. Each faculty member will receive a copy of this announcement from this Office. Please see that interested faculty members receive these more detailed guidelines.

RMJ:mnk
attachments
cc: Honors Council
W. Schubert
D. Weible
D. Miller

ABSTRACT: PROPOSAL FOR A CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GRANT, SUMMER 1979

Name_____ Department_____

College_____ Date_____

( ) Full Grant
( ) Partial Grant
If full grant requested, would partial grant be acceptable?_____

( ) Development of new courses(s)
( ) Revision of existing course(s)
( ) Other

Previous curriculum development experience and financial support.

Description of Project

Funds requested: (a) Salary $_____ (b) Expenses $_____ (c) Total $_____

Approved (Department Head)_____ Date_____

Approved (College Dean)_____ Date_____

Attach: Detailed proposal
Statement of Office of Instructional Resources Development
Budget

GRANT MONEY

why?

UICC BELIEVES IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT/FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, and unlike most major universities, SUPPORTS this belief with DOLLARS. Each year it awards in excess of $20,000 for course improvements through curriculum development as an inseparable component of faculty development that leads to student growth.

for what?

This year a new thematic approach is being initiated. The theme for the 1978-79 competition is curriculum development for honors students, i.e., students who show capacity that exceeds normal course expectations. Project possibilities are unlimited but these are a few:

- resource centers
- self-paced curricula
- honors courses
- interdisciplinary courses
- peer tutoring
- computer assisted programs
- special seminars
- novel independent study arrangements
- accelerated courses
- core sequences
- upper level introductory courses

who can advise?

Many person are available for questions about the grants. Examples follow:

- Richard Johnson
  Academic Vice Chancellor
  Overall Orientation-Ext. 4433
- David Miller
  OIRD
- Philip Tiemann
  OIRD
- Susan Markle
  OIRD

  Construction and design of instructional materials - Ext. 4800
- Samuel Schrage - Ext. 3453
  Director-University Honors Council
- David Vezzetti - Ext. 5342
  Chairman-Honors Council
- David Weible - Ext. 8836
  Previous Chairman, Curriculum Development Grants Committee
- William Schubert - Ext. 5628
  Chairman, Curriculum Development Grants Committee
  Curriculum development procedures

for whom?

UICC faculty members or groups of faculty members who are willing to do serious planning to improve or create courses are invited to apply.

how?

Look for a special bulletin from Academic Vice Chancellor Richard Johnson to be forwarded to you by your Dean or Department Head. It describes details of proposal procedures and intentions of the Curriculum Development Grants Program. Proposals are to be submitted via your department or college to the Office of the Academic Vice Chancellor for review.

when?

Proposals submission deadline is December 8, 1978. Award notification is made at the conclusion of Winter Quarter. Work is to be conducted during the summer.

BONUS!
Each Year, award recipients are considered for an extra $1000 award for the best annual curriculum development project following implementation and evaluation.

bonu$!!!

APPENDIX B

December 20, 1977

To: (Name of Grant Recipient)
(Department)

From: Curriculum Development Grants Committee

There is a question as to whether Curriculum Development Grants should continue to be awarded. We have been requested by the Academic Resources Board to study the Grants awarded in the last few years. Please respond to the following questions and return to David Weible, German Department, 1623 UH, by January 6, 1978.

1. What was the original purpose of the proposal?

2. Were the original objectives met?

3. In what ways have you continued to develop the original product?

4. In which course(s) does the product of your work play a significant role? How many students are affected? If applicable, do other faculty/institutions use your material?

5. What other tangible consequences resulted from your work (publication, or other dissemination of either the product or data on the use of the product; subsequent grant money--give amount, source; professional advancement)?

6. Can you mention any other positive or negative effects which receipt of this grant had on your professional development?

7. Would you have chosen to do the initial work had no support been forthcoming?

8. Can you mention other ways in which the University could be more supportive in the area of curriculum development?

9. To what extent did this work lead to a modification of your department's curriculum?

10. What evaluative procedures, if any, did you apply to student response (academic and/or attitudinal) to the results of your work? What did the evaluation show?

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS, Summers 1976-77

Name	Amount	1	2	3	4a	b	5a	b	c	6	7	8	9	10
Aks	$3,844													
Arzbaecher	4,536													
Brown	2,900													
Ewer	3,067		Y		Soc 201 (600)	N	Y	N	N	2	N	4	1	Y 4
Friedman	2,056													
Jameson	1,689													
Kotin	3,356		Y		Chem 107 (1500)	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	4	5	5
Liu	5,222													
Krause	3,660		Y		see report		N	N	N	4	N	5	2	NA
Plumpp	2,333													
Richek	2,667													
Scherrer	1,333	mistakenly responded with regard to more recent grant (see below)												
Wadycki	3,367		Y		QM 270 (200-300)	Y	Y	N*	N	4	N	4	3	4
Weible	2,256		Y		Ger 101 (300)	Y	N*	Y	Y	4	?	5	5	5
Jackard	3,460		Y											
Fletcher	(3,222)	declined												
Richmann	2,924													
Simon	4,574		Y		EnrE 396		N	N	N	N	N	5	3	4*
Dutton	5,823													
Lipscomb	3,089													
Murray	4,036													
Woolley	4,406		N*		NA		NA-----			3	N	N	N	N*
McNeil	4,789		Y		Phys 111 (300)	Y	Y*	N	N	5	Y*	4	3*	5
Ewer	1,600		Y		Soc 201		Y	N	N	1	N	5	1*	4
Penney	(2,852)	declined												
Boulanger	1,487		Y		Ed 230 (150)	Y	N	N*	N	2	N	3	3	4
Fredrick	1,868		Y*		Ed 230 Ed 250 (50)	N	see report			4	?	4	3	see report
Levine	3,964													
Naaman	3,289		Y		MatE 340 (30)	N	Y	N	N	3	Y*	4	3	5*
Marder	4,845													
Pagnamenta	4,400		Y*		Phys 321 (36)	Y	N	N	N	4	N	3	3	5
Pavlak	4,911													
Szepe	3,711		Y		(30)	Y	(Y)	N	N	3	?	4	?	4

Tetz	3,337	Y	*	Y*	N	N	N	3	N	5	?	?
Boyer	3,456	Y	AD 270,212 (200)		Y	N	N	4	N	4	3	5
Chien	3,945											
Dominowski	5,345	Y	(10)		Y*	N	N	3	N	5	1	4*
Kahn	3,298	Y*	Ed 341,342 (30)		N	N	N	3	N	N	N	4*
Mellon	4,833	Y	Comp 101 Comp 102 (4000)	Y	Y	N	N	3	Y	5	5	5
Sokol	5,178	Y*	*	Y	N	N	N	5	Y*	3	3	*
Wang	4,336	Y	Mus 209 Mus 298 (20)	N	(Y)	N	N	NA	N	NA	3	SR[4]

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GRANTS, Summers 1973-77

Name	Amount	1	2	3	4a	b	5a	b	c	6	7	8	9	10
Balch	4,018	Not solicited--too recent												
Clark	1,526	Not solicited--too recent												
Kaplan	3,795	Not solicited--too recent												
Layman	3,246	Not solicited--too recent												
Scherrer	3,461		Y		PE 254,427 (175)					SR	?	4	SR	SR
Upshaw	6,481	Not solicited--too recent												

---

39 projects; 7 no longer at UICC
32 left; of these 22 responded (69%)

Items one and three could not be effectively summarized, at least not in the time at the Chairperson's disposal.

Key to above items:

2. Y=Yes; N=No; *= See report

4a. Course number (#of student/year)

4b. Y, N

5a. Y, N, *, (Y)=work in progress

5b. Y, N

5c. Y, N

6. N, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5----1=very negative; 5=very positive

7. Y, N, *

8. N, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5----1=dislike program; 5=very enthusiastic supporter of Curriculum Development; (N.B., average response=4.2)

9. 1=no effect; 3=one course effected; 5=strong effect

10. 1=negative results; 5=very positive results

DMW/1-23-78

A Report on the Questionnaire Regarding Past Curriculum Development Grant Awards 1973-1976

1. What was the original purpose of the proposal?

Due to the great variety of proposals funded during the four years covered by this report, it is difficult to summarize the responses to this first question. Still, twenty of the twenty-one responses (95%) may be grouped into three general categories: (1) generation of laboratory materials and exercises--33%; (2) development of new course(s)--29%; (3) development of instructional resource materials (videotapes, learning packets, etc.)--33%. Most of the items included in groups one and three involved the utilization of media other than print (videotape, PLATO, etc.). In such instances, the grant was often made with a view towards providing the recipient with an opportunity to acquire the requisite abilities and skills.

2. Were the original objectives met?

As the table shows, 95% of the respondents replied in the affirmative although four of these responses were qualified to some extent.

3. In what ways have you continued to develop the original product?

It is again difficult to summarize what sort of continued development has taken place. However, one can break down the responses into three broad groups. Fourteen of twenty-one respondents (67%) indicated that some further development has taken place. Five out of twenty-one (24%) indicated extensive subsequent development. Only two respondents (10%) declared that they had done nothing more in the way of developing or expanding their original work.

4. In which course(s) does the product of your work play a significant role? How many students are affected? In applicable, do other faculty/ institutions use your material?

The responses to this item are most easily surveyed on the attached table. Under 4a are listed the course(s) involved and the total number of students affected (per annum). A total of 7,500 students are affected yearly by the results of the grants awarded during these four years.

Under 4b, Y or N indicate whether or not other faculty or institutions have made use of the materials produced under the grant. Of the specific responses to this item, 71% indicated that other parties had indeed utilized their materials.

5. What other tangible consequences resulted from your work (publication, or other dissemination of either the product or data on the use of the product; subsequent grant money--give amount, source; professional advancement)?

The table summarizes the responses to this item as follows: 5a, publication (Y/N); 5b, grant money (Y/N); 5c, professional advancement (Y/N). Of the direct responses to 5a, 56% indicated that some publication either had resulted or was in progress. However, with 5b, only one of the respondents could point to outside funding resulting from his original work. With 5c too, only one responded affirmatively.

6. Can you mention any other positive or negative effects which receipt of this grant had on your professional development?

The average response to this item (3.3) indicates rather mixed feelings regarding the effects of the grant on professional development. On the one hand, the grant often led to the acquisition of new and valuable professional skills and insights. On the other hand, there is a widespread feeling that the sort of activity encouraged by these grants is actually counterproductive in terms of promotion and tenure. One ends up "wa$ting" one's time in this regard.

7. Would you have chosen to do the initial work had no support been forthcoming?

Of those who are clearly decided on this issue, i.e., answered with a definite yes or no, 78% responded in the negative. If we may take this response at face value, it would seem that discontinuation of this program would have a profoundly inhibiting effect on curriculum development on our campus.

8. Can you mention other ways in which the University could be more supportive in the area of curriculum development?

The average "attitudinal" response here was 4.2 indicating a high overall level of support for the program. Of the specific suggestions, the following were made most often: more funding (8 times); more promotion and tenure credit (4); increased technical support (PLATO, etc.) (3); and increased publicity (2).

9. To what extent did this work lead to a modification of your department's curriculum?

With reference to this item, it should be noted that many (if not most) of these proposals were not intended to modify the departmental curriculum. However, in those instances where such was the intent, the rate of success was very high.

10. What evaluative procedures, if any, did you apply to student response (academic and/or attitudinal) to the results of your work? What did the evaluation show?

The average response on this item (4.4) suggests a very positive attitude on the part of the respondents and their students to the end product of their work under the grant

Summary

Although we received responses from only 69% of the former project directors whom we still were able to contact, we feel that this is a sufficiently large percentage to yield reliable results - granting that the results may be somewhat biased towards the positive end of the scale.

The respondents were overwhelming in their support of the program. Virtually unanimous support came also from the department heads who responded to our inquiry (Chemistry, Psychology, Music, Physics, Engineering, Linguistics, Physical Education, Jane Addams Social Work, Art, Sociology, and English). Admittedly, those questioned were all individuals who had benefitted directly from the program. If the program is to receive more broadly based support, a greater effort will have to be made to publicize the results of these grants. The grantees should be encouraged to publish the results of their work and, where possible, seek to obtain outside funding for the continuation of their projects.

Still, even at present it seems safe to say that the money expended on this program has served both to develop the potential of individual faculty members and to enrich the curriculum to a significant degree. I concur with the opinion of most of the respondents that this program should be expanded rather than cut back. The committee in its final meeting this year will draft a set of proposals and recommendations towards that end.

Respectfully submitted
David M. Weible